

D 8869

The following article, printed in English, appeared in the "Hamburger Tageblatt" of November 30, 1938.

SHANGHAI MUNICIPAL  
S. B. REGISTRY  
D. 8869  
Date 12/1/39

The World Viewed from Germany

VICTORIOUS STRUGGLE OF THE  
SUPPORTERS OF PEACE

A weekly Review of Foreign Politics by Max Baumann

Although the world has for some weeks again been hearing the shrill screams of war-agitation, and the vindictive howls of the mischief-makers, the diplomatic and political endeavours to strengthen the tendency of peace have been continued and progress has been very evident especially during the last few days. The two fronts are opposed to each other with the same violence: on the one hand the triangle of order formed by the States of identical ideology, i.e. Germany, Italy and Japan, and on the other hand the centre of all activity of decomposition: Soviet-Russia with its adherents in Red Spain, and latterly the United States of America. Between these two front-lines there are numerous nations who on the one hand like to adopt an attitude of ideologically irrelevant rejection of the "Authoritative" states, but who on the other hand are realising more and more what a dangerous role Bolshevism is playing in the struggle of world politics. It is becoming continually more and more evident that there must be a definite and clear decision in the long run either for or against this power of "disorder on principles". It apparently seems necessary to repeatedly point out to the other nations that the principle of order in the community of nations does not by any means necessitate the adoption of a dictatorial regime. Both Mussolini and the Fuehrer and Chancellor have repeatedly declared that Fascism and National-Socialism must in no way be considered "articles

(2)

for export," but that each nation must create a political formula according to its own requirements. It is, however, inevitable that the struggle against the powers of disorder, Bolshevism and the Jewry, cannot only be confined to foreign politics, but this problem also greatly affects inner-political arrangements.

These inner-political consequences are at present clearly shown by the serious crisis in France. A People's Front-Government, to a great extent under Marxistic influence, has brought the country into serious danger by maladministration, and the only cure can be found in the radical emergency-decrees now issued by the Minister of Finance, M. Reynaud. As the People's Front may in any case be considered completely broken up by the awakened opposition of the healthy elements of the people, the Marxistic circles are using the endeavours of the Government as a welcome pretext for bringing about a decisive battle. There is no doubt whatever, that the strikes and the attempts to create strikes as well as the recently announced general strike for 24 hours as also the communistic threats regarding the intended visit of the German Foreign Minister in Paris, all emanate from one source and it is proved that these occurrences are not spontaneous and locally limited actions, but they are carried out according to plan. Germany, in principle, does not in any way interfere with the internal problems of any other state, but the observation of the occurrences in France is inevitable, because any changes of a serious nature would necessarily influence the foreign political situation.

In the first place such an unstable situation of home affairs makes France less worthy of credit from the point of view of foreign politics, whereas on the other hand the happenings will show the French statesmen the necessity for quick and energetic decisions. This

is of importance to us, because the negotiations regarding a German-French Agreement paralleled to the Munich Agreement between Germany and England, have progressed very far, and the signing of such an Agreement during the visit of Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop to Paris is planned. France has evidently desired such an Agreement for some time, after being none too pleased about the special success of Mr. Chamberlain in Munich, Foreign politics in Paris suffer to an extraordinary degree from fears, which are in actual fact unjustified, but which emanate from the apprehension that the position of power held by France may be adversely affected <sup>to</sup> an unbearable degree. For this reason the Anglo-French discussions regarding the Munich meetings, and its possible consequences were followed by new conferences between Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Halifax with the French statesmen. The principal subjects of discussion were matters of a military nature, if the statements published are to be believed, and it should be pointed out that the prominence given to military points of view in Paris and London, which have been very noticeable lately, do not throw an entirely positive light on the political policy of Western Europe.

Foreign countries have used the unsatisfactory military position of England and France during the Czech crisis as an excuse for the attitude of Mr. Chamberlain, and to a certain extent that of Mr. Daladier, in Munich. The necessity of military measures was stated to be the consequence, and indirectly it was evident that, if any European crisis should arise in the future, it was intended to adopt a different attitude. Is it necessary in this connection to point out the great reserve, which has always been displayed by Germany in its foreign policy? We have never demanded anything but Germany territory, as is proved by the settlement of the amalgamation with Austria,

and the clearing up of the question of the Sudeten districts. Are the other powers able to supply evidence of similar restraint? From a military point of view we have only taken back what was taken from us in Versailles with the assertion that our disarmament, and we only took back our military freedom, and re-occupied the demilitarized zone, when it was indubitably certain that an international disarmament on the part of the strongly armed states was not seriously intended at all.

These German measures are in no way sufficient reason for the armament campaign, which has recently set in, and German foreign policy has always been so straightforward and clear that nobody can believe that we will in future suddenly make immeasurable demands, especially as this would be contrary to the definite statements of the Fuhrer and Chancellor. If, in spite of this the possibilities of war are mentioned, and if details of possible British landing corps are discussed, one is reluctantly forced to come to the conclusion that preparations are possibly being made for some "General Settlement of Account" which may take place in future. This is no doubt quite in accordance with the hopes of the continually active instigators, the Churchill-Eden-group in England, and the single front between de Kerilles and Marxists in France. We hope however, that the responsible leaders of politics have dispensed with such dangerous and warlike thoughts. We do not express this hope for reasons of fear, because in London and Paris one will have to realise that from a military point of view we are in every way safe, and also from a political aspect we to-day have a sure and firm position in Europe.

As political negotiations are now taking place in Europe, we think we may come to the conclusion that England and France have accepted the new position in Europe,

recognising therefore our predominance in the South-East, as much as Italy's claim to be considered the leading power in the Mediterranean. We presume that they also recognise that our legal claim for our colonies is being maintained, and that the fulfilment is not in any way contrary to the colonial necessities of England and France. Above all, however, it is simultaneously considered agreed that Soviet-Russia is to the greatest possible extent eliminated from Europe. This means that from a world-political point of view bolshevism, which is working towards a world revolution, has lost ground, which it considered extremely important, and for which it is still struggling desperately in certain instances even to-day. Examples are the occurrences in France recently, and the rather less important struggle in Red Spain. These struggles, however, cannot alter the fact that owing to the triangle Berlin-Rome-Tokio, Russia is playing a losing game not only in Europe, but probably also in Asia.

The extent of the necessity for a thorough combat against the Bolshevistic danger can be realised by the echo of the day on which the Antikomintern Agreement between Germany, Italy and Japan had been in force two years. The three powers on that day openly declared through their Foreign Ministers that they are willing to continue the struggle with increasing intensity, and that the importance of this action is extremely far-reaching. A special point is the factor that the struggle is not of a negative nature, and not only aims on the elimination and removal of Bolshevism, but that its real object is the positive strengthening and combination of all powers of order. For this very reason the triangle has become a centre of crystallisation for a great variety of positive tendencies and powers. In the South-East the Bolshevistic

and People's Front democratic tendencies are retreating all along the line, and everywhere the intention is felt to establish contact with the strengthened and constructive powers of the axis. Accordingly, a large new block has been created to deal with the requirements of order and economics in the Far East, and this is to cover China after inner renewal as well as Manchoukuo, Korea and Japan. No doubt, it will be successful in spite of opposition from the imperialism of the U.S.A., its capitalists and the Jews.

The three powers of the Antikomintern-Agreement, apart from the political aims, have recognised the necessity to fundament their work by spiritual power, and to supplement their political agreement by cultural co-operation. This is the object of the culture agreement recently announced between Germany and Italy, and Germany and Japan. These agreements take consideration of the principle differences of the peoples concerned, which are only able to be sustained by their own personal vigour, but, apart from this the way is being cleared for fruitful interchange, creative suggestions and mutual completion, very far removed from internationalism and collectivism. The connections between the antique the guardian of which in many ways in to-day Mussolini's Italy, and the Northern sphere of culture, the inheritance of which Germany has taken up, are manifold. There are, however, many fertile possibilities for cultural interchange, and mutual suggestions also between Germany and Japan, and no doubt German science, such as medicine, or German art are important factors, whereas we have to be thankful to the Far East for many wonderful inducements. It may be expected that this agreement may be supplemented shortly by a Culture Agreement between Japan and Italy, which is

still outstanding.

It is understandable that such a firm block of peace and order, as has been created between Germany, Japan and Italy, is fascinating and must be attractive for the nations who are situated in the midst of a world of hate and disorder and continual threats, and who are longing to find a way which will enable them to work peacefully. This effect is found in the South-East, where one turns to Germany not only owing to its organic geopolitical position, but also at the same time one turns away from the principles of the Western-nationalistic states, who forget the peoples for reasons of state, and the former surely plays the most important rôle in inter-European relationship. A new spirit of mutual goodwill is gaining ground. The settlement of the relationship between Germany and Czecho-Slovakia is a fine example of these new possibilities, because after the elimination of the Benesch-clique, westernised and freemasons, Prague immediately turns to Germany, and it is certain that Czecho-Slovakia is not threatened with suppression or violation. Honest and straight forward co-operation for our mutual benefit is desired, and these are not mere words, but principles which will have effect in deeds as is proved by the Agreement just reached between Germany and Czecho-Slovakia for the solution of traffic problems. The motor-road which is to be constructed through Czecho-Slovakia territory, but which will be considered extraterritorial, has been described by international jurists as an outstanding development. For us it is only important that also in this instance life itself and its necessities, were the basis of negotiations, free from all formalities, and this is only possible when both parties show a goodwill. There is no doubt that both Germany and



Czecho-Slovakia will benefit to the same extent by this new great traffic route, which is of considerable importance for us, because it shows to what extent the Czecho-Slovakian State, which was once established by Benesch and Masaryk with the consent of the Allied Powers as a barrier, has now been endowed with a spirit of co-operation which allows us unhindered entrance on a broad front to our natural sphere of influence in the South East.

Germany has regulated its relationship with Czecho-Slovakia, and the fundamental lines for the future construction of this State have evidently been defined. It is to be an Allied State, which will consist of three autonomous sections, the Czechish, the Slovakian and the Carpathian-Ukraine districts. It appears, however, that there are still some difficulties to be overcome before this construction can be carried out, especially in connection with the Carpathian-Ukraine. Apparently both Hungary and Poland expected the solution of the question to be different to the decision which the German-Italian arbitration tribunal arrived at in Vienna. These two States have, therefore, now repeatedly stated that the Ruthenians, the inhabitants of the Carpathian-Ukraine, are not satisfied with the solution. In view of its own Ukraine population Poland is demanding a part for itself, whereas Hungary demands the rest on the principle of "re-establishment of historic frontiers." In addition there is a persistent rumour in foreign countries that the two states are prepared, if necessary, to create a direct Polish-Hungarian frontier by force. No doubt, this may be considered a source of future complications, perhaps the importance of this matter may shortly become evident. The principle of the new conditions in the South-East is, however, not in any way

affected. The same applies to the inner-political difficulties of Hungary, which became evident through the crisis, which the Imredy Government has just had to overcome. It became evident at the same time how necessary it is for Hungary to overcome the feudalistic-reactionary forms as well as the Western influences of the People's Front. The social questions of Hungary should be thoroughly re-established in the spirit of the Hungarian people.

Germany has turned principally to the South-East as far as its interests are concerned, but this does not mean that we are not interested in world politics or overseas affairs. Our colonial claims are an example, and our economic interests in overseas districts are principally found in South-America. We have already in the past pointed out to what extent the agitation against Germany in the United States is created by the wish to destroy our economic position in Latin-America, and to replace same by a stronger influence of Dollar-Imperialism. Naturally, Washington cannot state this openly, because the Latin-American States very much distrust their Northern brother, who is always preaching peace. A certain detour is therefore used by robbing the Monroe-Doctrine of its imperialistic U.S.A. character in an endeavour to establish same as a general principle on the American Continent. The object is, therefore, the creation of a special "continental consciousness", which is opposed to other continents, in practice principally against Germany. For this reason endeavours are made with the help of inconsiderate agitation in the Jewish question and all unclean methods available to North-American politics, to awaken the belief that a military danger for Latin-America threatens from Germany.

Some time ago the ridiculous idea was spread that the German settlers in Brazil would be the cause of the minority question being opened up by Germany with the demand that an annexation of the German districts should take place, thus establishing a military platform on the American Continent. It is now being said with commendable speed that any possible German colonies on the West Coast of Africa might and were intended to be a threat to America, and unfortunately the irresponsible statements of Mr. MacDonald, the British Dominion Minister, and the French General Weygand could be given as reference.

It is not necessary to say that such absurd rumours have any foundation in fact. On the other hand, however, the increasing strength of the political block of peace: Germany, Italy and Japan, cannot be detrimentally influenced by such rumours, and it would be as well if this were realised not only by the opponents of Germany in the U.S.A., but by the mischief-makers all over the world.

Copy of an extract in English appearing in the "Hamburger  
Pageblatt" of November 9, 1938

The World Viewed from Germany  
COLONIAL QUESTION AND THE TWO EUROPEAN AXES

A weekly review of foreign politics / by Max Baumann

A speech held by Herr Rudolf Hess at the close of last week was an accounting for past events and a review of the future. The contents of this speech, which was held on the occasion of the incorporation of a new political district into the National Socialist Labour party in Germany, again dealt with the world historical developments which led up to the settlement of the Sudetan problem, an event which did more for the establishment and maintenance of peace in Europe than innumerable conference of the past years. These developments were more effective than written agreements and nice speeches. A second speech held at the commencement of the new week by the Fuehrer and Chancellor deals in a very direct and just way with the agitation of foreign countries, especially with the loudest of these agitators for war, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Greenwood, who apparently can reconcile the speech which he held as duty for the Leader of the Opposition with his apparently peaceful attitude. In his speech Mr. Greenwood demanded the destruction of 120 million human beings as well as the total elimination of the authoritative states. The real character and attitude of this group of irresponsible politicians is not often shown so shamelessly to the world. It was, therefore, particularly necessary that the Fuehrer and Chancellor of Germany should strongly protest, and he pointed out that the much praised constitution of democracy creates the danger that this Mr. Greenwood may one day become a member of a British Government and would thereby receive the opportunity to put his attitude into effect. We have declared often enough that we would like to live in peace and friendship especially with England, but we must, of course be prepared for and protected against the

E.

FILE

12  
1/10/38

2003

532 712 FILE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

danger mentioned.

The existence of these warmongers in the opposition need not in any way belittle the earnest and continuous endeavours of the British and French Prime Ministers in the interest of an European understanding, but, unfortunately, a prominent place is being given to these methods of the opposition by discussions in the press which are now commencing regarding the necessity for disarmament, such as was a short while ago recommended by Mr. Lloyd George. The Fuehrer was quite correct when he pointed out that the principal necessity was a "disarmament of minds." The willingness to allow other countries to continue in their own way and in a friendly spirit must be the foundation for collaboration in Europe. Germany is in a very dangerous position in the centre of Europe. Its territory is unsafe on all sides owing to its geographical and political situation, and it cannot forego its right to carry out necessary armaments, owing to its responsibilities towards the peaceful world and employment of its inhabitants, at any rate not until there are no longer groups of politicians who may one day become members of the government of their countries and who already now declare that, according to their opinion, the destruction of the authoritative states is a necessity. We have just recently had an instance of the continual endeavours which are being made to cause international mischief. This was when a Soviet vessel on the way to Leningrad was sunk by an auxiliary cruiser of National Spain near the coast of England. This event was utilised as a reason in England and France to commence a wild and unjustified agitation against the Franco Government. Unfortunately, even the "Times" considered it necessary to arrive at the conclusion that the Franco regime could hardly be granted the rights of war-waging party, but this conclusion was, no doubt, arrived at on the strength of completely onesided reports of the facts. On the other hand,

the reports of the British Government authorities clearly state that the occurrence took place outside the three-mile zone, and, therefore, the agitation against National Spain was not particularly successful. In accordance with an old-established recipe one, therefore, turned against Germany in connection with this matter, and the attitude was based on the statement that apparently a German submarine had been seen. The broadcasting station at Strasbourg marches at the head of these agitators. Mr. Daladier only a short while ago confirmed the necessity that propaganda and agitation in the press must cease and that an objective attitude towards the German neighbour must be adopted. We sincerely welcome this point of view, but have unfortunately been forced to come to the conclusion that up to now this has only been theory and there has been no actual influence on the activities of the agitators.

There is very much room for improvement both in England and France in connection with this matter. Last week we already pointed out that a settlement of these questions and the establishment of a stronger interpolitical stability are of the utmost importance if European negotiations are to be continued with any likelihood of success. We are certainly prepared to recognise that M. Daladier is continuing his efforts towards bringing about satisfactory negotiations, and it certainly would appear that the Popular Front ideology in France is dying out and has lost all political canvassing power. The attitude of silence which has been adopted by the Foreign Minister M. Bonnet appears to prove to what extent French politics are undergoing a period of change, and further that efforts are being made to dissolve a complicated net of political agreements and liabilities towards other countries. M. Bonnet in his speech at the party meeting of the Radical Socialists not only restricted his speech in view of the fire catastrophe at Marseilles to a statement of facts, but he evidently wished to avoid a review of future plans, because France is evidently now remembering what is necessary and of vital interest for the French population.

The time when the Little Entente in the south-east of Europe was utilised by France as a barrier against Germany appears to lie in the very distant past. Those countries in the Balkans and the Danube districts appear to have come to their senses to a very large extent, and even Paris recognises that an isolation of Germany not only permanently endangers the peace of Europe but also of France as a working country. By recognising these facts France must also realise that Germany holds a special position in the south-east of Europe. This position not only emanates from many years of cultural intercourse but also from the geographical and political situation which closely links the heart of Europe with the inter-European belt of states, often called the "devil's belt" by England because the complicated ethno-political conditions always appeared menacing to them. In addition, it should be remembered that economic connections between Germany and the states of the south-east have continually improved, and this is attributable to the mutual advantages mentioned, to an interchange of organized economic requirements as well as a certain balance between the agricultural trade in the south-eastern countries and the industrial supplies of Germany. This close connection and the special position which Germany holds in view of the above in the south-east were clearly recognised by the British Prime Minister Mr. Chamberlain in his last speech before the House of Commons on the 1st November. His words deserve special attention and recognition, because this was the first instance when the special rights of Germany in the south-east of Europe were clearly recognised by England, and because such an attitude is a pleasant proof of the sincere desire on the part of the British Prime Minister to bring about really stabilised and natural conditions in Europe.

It should, of course, be remembered that these words must not be considered as a present for Germany which could just as well have been withheld, but the statement made must be considered as the natural consequence of an objective

consideration of actual circumstances. The south-eastern states are really on an intimate and confidential footing with Germany, because they realise that Germany recognises the rights of the young states according to its own political and general doctrines and, of course, these states are at present also on a permanent and firm footing of economic exchange with Germany. A wonderful triumph in proof of this attitude of confidence was the arbitrary decision recently given in Vienna in connection with the frontier disputes between Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. Both these states declared from the beginning that they would abide by the decisions arrived at by the Italian and German Foreign Ministers. The verdict was actually given in due course in accordance with the ethnographical situation, but at the same time the sensitive national feelings of the peoples concerned were respected and taken into consideration as far as ever possible. This is especially necessary when the question of frontiers in the centre of Europe is being considered, even if the complications caused thereby are considerable. It is very noticeable that the Vienna verdict was given by the two nations of the axis Berlin-Rome, whereas France and England, whose participation was at first intended at Munich, stood aside. This is, of course, in accordance with the actual situation resulting from the close connections between Germany and Italy and the south-eastern districts, whereas, on the other hand, the western powers have only superficial interests there. Owing to their increased interests in other political spheres, the collaboration between Paris and London has become stronger, and it has appeared lately as if the Anglo-French Entente is likely to develop into a second axis in European politics, Germany has no objections to such developments as long as it is perfectly clear that close co-operation is essential and that willingness is shown by all parties. It is possible that this will be clearly established during the next few days, because France has invited the British Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax to proceed to Paris for the purpose of various discussions. Although this visit may be considered a "return of the compliment" as an act



of German foreign policy in view of the present state of French  
statesmen to London, there is a clear feeling that it is  
intended that the subject should also be taken into consideration  
in the course of the political discussions affecting both countries.

It may be assumed that the question of the colonies  
will play an important part in these discussions. It should be  
remembered that simultaneously the Union of South Africa is  
confronted with this question, having lost its British rule. Pirow  
is going to discuss matters. Up to now Mr. Pirow has made  
no statement regarding his powers, nor does he know particulars  
of his mission, but it is felt that certain international parties  
are making every effort to create confusion in connection with  
the whole problem. The attitude which we have already mentioned  
towards the small colonial states adopted a similar attitude  
towards Germany by stating that a transfer of Portuguese, Dutch  
or Belgian colonies is being considered etc., of course, being  
continued and, therefore the fundamental point of view can only  
be repeated. The Fuehrer and Chancellor and General von Epp  
have definitely stated that the return of the colonies is a  
question of right and of German honour. The problem as such also  
has an economic side in the necessity to supply Germany with  
necessary raw materials, but the transfer of colonies of other  
states who have never been opposed to us in the colonial sphere  
cannot result in a satisfactory settlement of the actual problem.  
The settlement can also not be reached by Germany making certain  
demands which would then be discussed with a view to arriving at  
a compromise. In principle, the basis must be that our  
opponents have the moral and just obligation to make up for a  
fault. Certain parties now declare that the loss of our colonies  
must be considered the result of our having lost the war. It  
must be stated, however, that the so-called legal point of view,  
which was adopted by the creation of the Versailles Treaty with  
its libellous statement regarding the cause of the war and the  
establishment of a system of Mandates, is now to be suddenly  
dropped. This Germany will not agree to!

Owing to the fact that at present the decision lies with the other parties, it is not considered an opportune time to deal in detail with Germany's claims for colonies, especially as valuable and sufficient German literature is easily available. It should be pointed out, however, that close co-operation between the axis Berlin-Rome on the one hand and London-Paris on the other hand is largely dependant upon the settlement of the German colonial problems. It is hardly necessary to state that, in addition, other political decisions will have to be taken in Europe. The expression Four-Powers Pact has a bad reputation with a number of politicians and statesmen, and we, therefore, would like to avoid same as much as possible. As a matter of fact, however, it should be realized that the co-operation between the four great powers must result in deciding the destiny of the continent of Europe, and this means that Soviet Russia must be considered excluded. The Pact between France and Soviet Russia is still in force, but the position is evidently critical, and criticism in France against this pact and the consequences which may arise therefrom is continually increasing. After all, the obligations resulting from the pact are not in any way in accordance with the vital interests of the French people. There is no doubt that political circles in France will sooner or later have to face the consequences. It is possible that the anti-French attitude which has lately been adopted in a very sharp manner by the Soviet press will make the decision somewhat easier for France.

There is also no doubt that such a clear separation would be of great benefit in securing the peace of Europe and in strengthening the innerpolitical stability of the continent. Owing to developments in non-European countries, the dissolution of such an agreement would be very welcome. As far as the Far East is concerned, the aim of Japan, as proclaimed on behalf of the Government in Tokio through the Speaker of the Foreign Office, the press and by Prince Konoye through the broadcasting system, a new

three-powers block is to be formed, which will result in co-operation between China, Manchukuo and Japan. It has been clearly stated in Tokio that the Pact of Nine is completely out of date, as far as China is concerned, and Japan therefore demands special rights in accordance with its geo-political and economic situation. These rights must result in the creation of a huge Japanese territory. The United States, who adopt a doctrinaire and anti-peace attitude, are defending their commercial interest against the coming developments by protesting sharply and endeavouring to find support from the European powers. If Europe wishes to avoid being involved in such a conflict in the Pacific by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull it is necessary to do everything possible immediately in order to bring about a firm and solid co-operation between the European nations.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Personas

25

John. J. ...

The Volunteer

**D. C. Special Branch.**



232

Sp. Br.)

Copy of an article in English appearing in the  
"Hamburger Tageblatt," dated November 2, 1938.

REC.D.

D.

Date

The world viewed from Germany

THE ATTITUDE OF WORLD POLITICS

A weekly review of foreign politics / by Max Baumann

Events in foreign politics as well as the speeches held during the past week show with particular clearness to what extent the traditional forms and political systems, as well as the political and economic relationship, are going through a process of change. This process is in many ways working towards unknown ends, but there is no doubt that the ideal foundations of the liberal capitalistic world principles, which have been finally buried, cannot be revived thereby. The economic relationship of the world in the form existing to a certain extent during the period before the great war, but still more propagated by the theorists and proclaimers of dogmatic ideas of capitalistic economic science as a desirable end, has finally disappeared, and the system of democracy which may at one time have been able to justify its historical importance for the counteracting of feudalistic forms of society has now proved itself as totally inadequate in view of the present day political, social and economic problems, which have to be solved now. This must be specially mentioned as a counterpart to a leading article in the "Times," in which that great English paper deals with the conditions between dictatorships and democracies. The article praises the democratic system of government in England, and mentions the necessity to explain to the German Nation that the progress made to-day in Germany would also have been possible under a democratic system of government. We quite understand that Englishmen are in favour of their own system of government, but we think that the actual political occurrences in England and France point quite clearly to endeavours being made to strengthen the authoritative tendencies in the system of government.

We would like to point out to the "Times," however, that it is useless for others to trouble themselves the salvation of the German people, because we lay special stress on the fact that we wish to live according to our own political convictions, and in addition we are of the opinion that there is sufficient material in England for those who wish to preach improvement.

Such exertions could, for instance, commence with the quotation of the speeches across the ocean, which have been very prominent lately since Mr. Churchill considered it in good taste to lecture the American broadcasting listeners on his complaints against his own government, Lord Halifax answered on the 26th October, and tried to show the Americans that Mr. Churchill was in the wrong. It seems to us to be a proof of the extent of political morality of the democratic countries that the same American press, which reported Mr. Churchill's speech in a sensational and prominent manner, did not consider it necessary to also deal with the answer given by Lord Halifax. (Hearst's stand against the agitators is a laudable exception.) Actually, however, this is not surprising, as the President of the United States himself apparently considered it necessary to support to the utmost of his ability the agitation of the American press. During the crisis he sent pathetic telegrams to the European statesmen, adopted the attitude of the great supporter of peace. But, on the other hand, on Thursday, the 27th October he held a speech in which he endeavoured to play off one European state against another. He, of course, accused German militarism, and stated that the U.S.A. have to defend the sanctity of agreements, in the end he took the part of the "Helpless people" who are hunted all over the globe, and are unable to find sanctity or a home anywhere.

Two arguments should be used against this speech: Humanity and respect for a given word are certainly indispensable for political morality, but these two virtues have, as far as we know, never been characteristic of the politics followed

by the U.S.A., certainly not to the extent which Mr. Roosevelt is now trying to make out. All who have studied the dark and bloody history of the American policy of extension, and have gone into the details of destruction and repression of the Indian race will really have gathered a shocking impression. We know that the difficult times of colonial pioneer work cannot be judged by the standards of to-day, but we think that just for that very reason the U.S.A. should avoid premature estimates of value. The world has already had to suffer once under the fact that there is little fundamental knowledge of European conditions in the extensive American Continent. We do not wish to have Mr. Roosevelt giving authoritative judgements today on questions which are purely European matters. This was unfortunately done by the renowned President Wilson, and we would not like a repetition. It would be more to the point if one endeavoured in America to concentrate on the fact that the people of America came from Europe, that its culture emanates from European foundations, and that without Europe America would be nothing. It is, of course, understandable that Washington pays strict attention to the problems affecting European politics, as these are of great importance to the developments of world politics as a whole. It is, however, undesirable that this attention on the part of Washington should develop into continual interference. The country which applied its Monroe-Doctrine everywhere, should especially understand the necessity for reticence; instead of which, however, the interference of the U.S.A. has gradually reached such proportions, and has assumed such a character that a strong protest is necessary.

Secondly a word should be said about the defence of the Jews on the part of the President of the U.S.A. It is a wellknown fact that Jews have always played an important part in his vicinity, commencing with the famous "brain trust," up to the prominent men of Wall Street, who to-day again carry on dollar-diplomacy with Roosevelt in spite of all innerpolitical

contradictions. Naturally Mr. Roosevelt is under a steady influence from this quarter, and the extent of such influence must increase simultaneously with the dissatisfaction of the European people towards the Jews. The public of the world should know, however, that President Roosevelt does not judge objectively in this matter, but alters the actual problems according to his own tendencies. It should be made known that the actual point is not that poor persecuted people must be supplied with sanctuary, but that the unbearable predomination of a race over many nations should no longer be countenanced. The consequences which Roosevelt is forced to accept owing to his connection with the Jews, had to be particularly realised in England recently. This was when the U.S.A. Ambassador in London asked that the promises given by Mr. Balfour should be kept, at the same time demanding that Palestine should be retained as the home of the Jews in spite of the Arabs' fight for liberty. It is for England to deal with this diplomatic step, whereas we can only consider same in the light of a symptom.

This attitude of the United States, and of certain agitators in the democratic countries of Western Europe, stands in strong contrast to the new development which commenced in Munich, and which was supported at the Radical-Socialist-Congress in France by the speech of Prime Minister Daladier, endorsed by the resolution passed on that occasion. The strict political doctrines, which have really governed France since the revolution of 1789, have recently collapsed to a great extent, and the way is now free for a fundamental improvement in the relations between France and Germany. Endeavours to bring about such an improvement have repeatedly been undertaken during the last few years, but up to now without success. The close collaboration between Paris and London as the fundamental principle of French foreign policy has again been accentuated in Marseilles, and in this fact we see a special possibility to facilitate the coming re-arrangement. As Soviet-Russia has now practically to a great extent been eliminated from European politics, the decision lies with the four Great Powers, which



are divided into two groups: on the one hand England and France and on the other Germany and Italy. This simplifies matters greatly, especially if good will can be found on both sides in an endeavour to clear up the existing differences. Important progress has been made in this direction between England and Italy by the Anglo-Italian Pact, which is to come into force in the middle of November. No doubt, this agreement will ease the position considerably for some time to come. It is certain, however, that the final settlement of the Spanish problem is an indispensable factor for the complete understanding between these two countries. This question will have to be tackled urgently, but it must be remembered that victory on the part of Bolshevism, and its allies in Spain would, according to the statements of the Italian officialist Gayda, be unacceptable for Italy. If it should be possible to arrive at an agreement in the Spanish question, this would cause a considerable improvement in the Italian - French relationship, which at present leaves something to be desired. General Franco has contributed voluntarily to the settlement of this problem by the discharge of Italian volunteers from his forces.

Such a tendency of development would naturally be strengthened by an actual stabilisation of the German-French relationship. The foreign press has published numerous rumours, and ostensibly reliable information regarding a long-term Non-Aggression-Pact, and also regarding suggestions for the restrictions of armaments, but, we do not intend to deal with these questions to-day. A primary condition for the improvement of the relationship between Berlin and Paris and also Berlin and London, is a further factor: The establishment of sufficient political stability within these democratic countries. We have just heard the critical remarks made by Mr. Herriot in Marseilles, whereas the anti-German element in England (Churchill, Eden, etc.) was a short while ago supported anew by the senile

voice of Mr. Lloyd George, the only living accomplice of the Treaty of Versailles, who considered himself competent to say that England had "purchased peace at the price of its conscience and its honour." All these men are trying hard to displace the statesmen at present in power in France and England, in order to obtain the appointments in question for themselves. We, however, take the liberty of asking what value can be placed on the political agreements made with well-wishing Mr. Chamberlain, and the ex-soldier Mr. Daladier, if there is a possibility of their being replaced to-morrow by others, who are definitely anti-German, and who agitate for war? These latter would consider the agreements made to be only of theoretical importance, and in the light of scraps of paper. The question we have raised shows that the stabilising of inner-political conditions in France and England must be a primary condition, if an understanding is to be reached in Europe, and a real and sincere spirit of good-will predominate.

In addition to this question of principle the individual point must also be dealt with, and from this angle the fact must be welcomed that the question of colonies held a prominent place in the recent political discussions in England. Unfortunately a disturbing intention was in several instances clearly discernible. On the one hand one tries to cause entanglements by stating, contrary to the truth, that Germany, is endeavouring to deprive the smaller Powers of their colonial possessions, either totally or at least in part. On the other hand it is said to have been declared that small countries such as Belgium, Portugal and Holland do not give sufficient guarantee for the administration and cultivation of colonial possessions such as must be demanded in view of the whole European interests to-day. Then again an attempt is made by declaring that the English would be prepared to allow the refund of those colonies which are at present principally held

by French Mandates, but the British people are simultaneously informed that German South West-Africa and the Tanganyika-Territory could not be given back to Germany owing to the large values which would be involved.

Against such arguments it was unavoidable that the German point of view should again be clearly stated, and this was done in the form of an official statement during the speech held by General von Hopp on the occasion of the opening of the Colonial School Building at Lage near Wehran. It was stated definitely that the restitution of the German Colonies, which were confiscated on the strength of erroneous pretexts, was a question of right and honour, and we therefore demand to receive back all our former colonial possessions, whereas the colonial possessions of other countries are not in any way connected with the vital problem. In view of the spasmodic endeavours to make the question of German colonies just at the present time a point of discussion in the foreign press, it had to be clearly pointed out that we will not allow anyone to prescribe the time to us when we will deal with this question in a concrete manner, it is after all the duty of the present Mandate-holders to take in hand the restitution of a wrong, and therefore the return of the Colonies to Germany is quite unsuitable as the subject of a political barter-transaction. Is it to be hoped that the English Cabinet quite clearly realized the position when it apparently dealt with the colonial question recently.

The points raised above were naturally also discussed between the German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, and the Italian Foreign Minister Ciano together with Mussolini, during Ribbentrop's recent visit to Rome. As is usual on such occasions, the sensation-mongers of foreign countries immediately pounced upon the Conference and tried to explain the reason for these meetings with the help of their imagination. But, they were all agreed that certain differences had arisen between Berlin and Rome. It would have been very easy for

them to have based their calculations on the great strength which the axis Berlin-Rome proved during the Czech crisis, and no doubt they would then have been able to explain the necessity for the discussion of international political problems as a whole. It is natural that for instance the problem of the Hungarian claims against Czechoslovakia should be discussed, especially as a satisfactory agreement between the two countries could not be reached, and also particularly in view of the fact that both Germany and Italy are interested in the final peaceful settlement of South East Europe. After both parties had decided to request Germany and Italy to act as arbitrators, it was essential that this problem should be clarified during the discussions in Rome in preparation for the Conference between the four Powers, which is taking place in Vienna to-day. All rumours, however, which dealt with serious differences between the National-Socialist and the Fascistic point of view have been proved completely wrong by the announcement of complete agreement between the German and Italian negotiators. No doubt, in the case of these rumours the wish was father to the thought.

In conclusion it should be stated that European agreement, and the establishment of stabilized order in our Continent are ill-served by the hopes that serious differences might arise between the friendly nations or - still worse - if endeavours are made to cause dissent. The friendly relationship between England and France is considered the fundamental basis of further political activity in the West, and in the same way the firm and unchangeable axis Berlin - Rome constitutes the incontestable basis of our foreign policy. This fact should be remembered by statesmen and politicians when considering further steps towards an understanding between the nations.